



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Bonner was not investigating nor writing a treatise on our law of evidence. Slight inaccuracies as to it may be pardoned.

One or two odd things may be mentioned. It seems that in criminal cases in the Areopagus a witness could not testify to important facts of which he had knowledge, unless he knew whether the accused was guilty or innocent and would first testify to that (pp. 15, 17). If a witness testified falsely, he was punished for the perjury. But he could make an oath disclaiming knowledge, and though this was wilfully false, he was not punished (p. 43). The evidence of this, however, is remarkably slight. Cross-examination was unknown (p. 20). Omens and dreams were admissible evidence (p. 19). The gratitude of the jury for past good deeds of the defendant was appealed to, as was also their cupidity for further financial benefits to the state which might arise from leniency (p. 13).

Mr. Bonner seems to have exhausted his sources, both original and secondary. He has shown acuteness in his deductions. The only real doubt as to his conclusions arises from the fear that he was overzealous in his search for a body of law on evidence in Athens.

CLARKE B. WHITTIER.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LAW SCHOOL.

Modern Methods of Charity. By CHARLES RICHMOND HENDERSON, assisted by others. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904. Pp. 715. \$3.50 net.

We learn our lessons of charity at vast expenditure of substance and of energy. We waste ourselves in experiments. We attack the bubbles which rise to the surface, and fail to dig deep for the nucleus of decay whence the bubbles come. We harm where we would help. The astronomer can calculate to a second the occurrence of an eclipse a hundred years away. The chemist can reduce a rock to its elements and determine the presence of each in its exact proportion. But no such certainty is possible in the vaguely defined territory which we call the "field of charity." In charity we are dependent on experience. The greater the variety and volume of experience at our back, the nearer we approach to sure-handed performance. Therefore any means by which the experiences and methods of others may be placed at our service, in convenient and usable form, saves us the time and labor necessary to obtain the experience for

ourselves. It also gives us the benefit of the differing points of view of others engaged upon problems similar to ours.

Perhaps no writer has done more than Dr. Henderson in gathering up the scattered and unarticulated results of experience in charity, and placing them before us in concise, simple form. Several years ago appeared his admirable book, *Dependents, Defectives and Delinquents*, which has become a widely used textbook. Later was published his summary of the writings of Dr. Thomas Chalmers, in which is given the gist of that eminent man's conclusions after many years of study and work among the poor. This in turn was followed by *Modern Prison Systems*. But the task which Dr. Henderson has undertaken in *Modern Methods of Charity* far surpasses that involved in the preparation of any of his books previously published. The work is monumental, both in the vast amount of labor required in collecting, sifting, and condensing material, and in the magnitude of the object intended to be accomplished. This object is nothing less than the description, in convenient form, of the methods and organization of public and private charity today in the more important countries of Europe and America. To each country is devoted a chapter, introduced by a brief historical sketch, showing the successive steps which have marked the development of charity, as general intelligence has increased and industrial and social conditions have changed. This prepares us to understand the present-day laws, methods, and point of view.

The book is encyclopedic, concrete. It is not a discussion of principles, but a record of experiences and a statement of methods based on lessons of experience. It is not philosophy, it is not theory; but it is a foundation upon which theory and philosophy may be erected. It is the product of the hardest and most tedious delving, searching, translating, comparing, and verifying. As it is a pioneer, it has lacked the help which predecessors, however incomplete, would have given. It has broken new paths which will not have to be broken again. The courage and patient industry which the book represents compel admiration.

Naturally there are errors. It is scarce conceivable that the reducing, sorting, and editing of the huge volume of material drawn from hundreds of widely scattered sources could produce a flawless result. That the work was performed by several persons, differing in experience, point of view, and judgment, accounts for some unevenness in clearness and in the value of examples selected as

illustrations. Here and there sources of information were not the latest accessible, and descriptions which would have been true a number of years ago were not accurate at the time they were written. Illustrations are not always representative or typical. Small experiments of unproved value, in a few instances, are set down as though they bore the seal of general acceptance.

It is worth noting that, at best, such a publication as this cannot remain accurate as an up-to-date statement of facts. It is no sooner off the press than it begins to fall behind the times. New laws are enacted, new ideas put into practice and old discarded. The entire body of charitable effort throughout the world is in a state of flux, and a picture of it at any moment must be a "snapshot," differing in countless details from any preceding or subsequent picture. This obvious fact is mentioned because it tends to minimize the importance of most of the errors which have found place in the book. That all the information in its 715 pages is not brought down to precisely the same date line will seem a smaller mistake with each succeeding year. When we cease trying to make the descriptions in the book fit minutely the comparatively unimportant details of the institutions about us, and come to regard the publication as a comprehensive picture of the charitable activities of the world at the beginning of the twentieth century, we shall appreciate better than now how faithfully, in all important aspects, the great task has been accomplished.

ERNEST P. BICKNELL.

CHICAGO BUREAU OF CHARITIES.

Our Own Times: A Continuous History of the Twentieth Century. Edited by HAZLITT ALVA CUPPY, and a Board of Special Editors. Vol. I, by BONNISTER MERWIN. New York: J. A. Hill & Co. Pp. xv + 453.

The central idea of the enterprise of which this volume is the first fruit may be described as a design to do year by year what Dr. Albert Shaw does month by month in his comments upon current events in the *Review of Reviews*. As the publishers' announcement suggests, the perspective of a single year may turn out to be different from that of a century; and it is equally true that a year will change the assortment of things worth remarking from month to month. Accordingly a volume made by binding together the most sagacious